



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,154	02/13/2004	Krishna V. Kotipalli	306213.01	5107
22971 7590 09/11/2009 MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399				
EXAMINER				
HE, JIALONG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/11/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com

ntovar@microsoft.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/777,154

**Applicant(s)**

KOTIPALI, KRISHNA V.

**Examiner**

JIALONG HE

**Art Unit**

2626

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/27/2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8-10, 16, 18-20 and 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8-10, 16, 18-20 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

#### ***Response to Amendments***

2. In the Remarks (page 8) filed on 7/27/2009, the applicant states that Claims 16 and 26 are amended and new claims 27-31 are added. However, by carefully comparing independent claim 6 in the newly filed claims with the last version of claim 6 (presented on 2/20/2009), the Examiner notes that the independent claim 6 is also amended by adding a new limitation "wherein the text string in the first alphabet is different than the phonetic string" at the bottom in a similar way as the amendment for claim 16. The Examiner assumes the status of claim 6 is "(Currently Amended)" and treats claim 6 as amended by considering the newly added limitation. A new ground of rejection is made necessitated by the newly added limitation.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/27/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons.

Regarding rejection to claim 6 under 102(b), the applicant argues (Remarks, pages 11-12) the previous Claim 6 is different from Bruso' teaching (US Pat. 5,649,214)

because **fig. 6 and fig. 7 of applicant's disclosure** shows the mapping using different characters while Bruso uses the same characters. The applicant further argues (Remarks, pages 13-14) that the transliteration **in applicant's specification** has different meaning than the transliteration disclosed in Bruso's teaching which uses the same characters.

In response, the Examiner notes the claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4).

The applicant asserts (Remarks, page 14) they define "transliteration" in the specification. MPEP 2111.01 (IV) states an applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer and may rebut the presumption that claim terms are to be given their ordinary and customary meaning by **clearly setting forth a definition** of the term that is different from its ordinary and customary meaning(s). See In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 1994). However, the Examiner could not find clear definition for "transliteration" in the specification. Therefore, transliteration in Bruso's teaching reads on the term "transliteration" in the claims.

The Examiner further notes that applicant arguments are moot because a new reference to Janakiraman is cited for teaching the argued features necessitated by newly added limitations.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claim 6, 8-10, 16, 18-20 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al (US Pat. 7,369,986, hereinafter referred to as Janakiraman) in view of Bruso et al. (US Pat. 5,649,214, hereinafter referred to as Bruso).

Regarding claims 6 and 16, Janakiraman discloses a computer implemented method and computer readable medium (**col. 8, computer readable medium embodiment**) for transliterating languages in a computing device comprising:

receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device (**col. 7, col. 7, lines 10-25, Fig. 4A-4E, receiving typed messages from a keyboard, fig. 5A, Tamil version, fig. 5C, English version**);

converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second

alphabet (**col. 6, lines 7-20, fig. 4A –fig 4E, transliteration Tamil language Governor to “aaLuunjar”**);

transliterating the text, wherein the text string in the first alphabet is different than the phonetic string (**fig. 6, #610, fig. 7, transliteration between Tamil and English**).

Janakiraman discloses using English characters to represent various languages used in India by transliteration (**title and Abstract**). Janakiraman does not disclose transliteration through an intermediary language.

Bruso discloses converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet (**Bruso, col. 2, col. 2, lines 43-67, mapping the intermediated coded character set to ISO 8859 character set (a third alphabet of a second language), also fig. 3A and 3B**).

Janakiraman and Bruso are analogous art and from a similar field of applicant's endeavor in transliteration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Janakiraman's teaching with Bruso's teaching to transliterate a language to another language through an through an intermediary language. One having ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to make such a modification because the documents are still available during transliteration procedure (**Bruso, col. 2, lines 33-46**).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Janakiraman further discloses the first language is a western language and the second language is an Indic language (**Fig. 4C, English, Fig. 5A, Tamil, also fig. 4A**).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Janakiraman further discloses the first language is an Indic language and the second language is another Indic language (**col. 1, lines 45-55, transliterating a selected word to a target language, col. 1, lines 14-20, target languages could be Hindi, Sanskrit, Urdu and all 18 India official languages**).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Janakiraman further discloses displaying the converted text string on an output device (**fig. 4A- fig. 4E**).

Regarding claims 25 and 26, Janakiraman further discloses transmitting the converted phonetic string to a remote processing device (**fig. 1, network, fig. 2, server, fig. 4A-4B, web browser**).

Regarding claims 27, Janakiraman further discloses the text string in the first alphabet is different than the phonetic string in the second alphabet (**col. 6, lines 10-20**,

**fig. 4A, Tamil writing and English language script for word “Governor” is different).**

Regarding claims 28, Janakiraman further discloses the phonetic string contains at least one character from the second alphabet which is not present in the first alphabet **col. 6, lines 10-20, fig. 4A, Tamil writing and English language using different characters).**

Regarding claims 29, the combined teaching of Janakiraman and Bruso further discloses the converted phonetic string contains at least one character from the third alphabet which is not present in the second alphabet **(Janakiraman, col. 1, lines 12-40, different Indian languages and English use different characters; Bruso, fig. 3, German language use Umlaut characters).**

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - Mani et al. (US PG Pub. 2003/0195741) discloses using English characters to represent various India languages by transliteration.
6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP



§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JIALONG HE whose telephone number is (571)270-5359. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 - 4:30, Alt Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JH/  
/Richemond Dorvil/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626